

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 11, 13, 15-17, 19-21 and 22-24 are amended. Claims 25-26 have been cancelled. The amendment of claims 16-17 and 19-21 corrects an antecedent reference. The amendment to independent claims 1, 10, 15 and 22 is supported by the specification, for example, at page 8, lines 5-9. No new matter is introduced by the amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pollak et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,106,297). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections.

With regard to independent claims 1, 10, 15 and 22, the claims have been amended to clarify that the spotter subsystem includes a transmitter-receiver and a GPS and communicates with at least one sensor system. As such, the claims now recite the means for implementing the spotter subsystem that, based on the response in the Office Action to the previous arguments made by Applicants, are admittedly not shown by Pollack et al.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4 and 15 as being unpatentable over Pollak et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,106,297) in view of Blume. (U.S. H1618) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

It is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case for the obviousness of the claimed invention has not been established. Because the entire teaching of Pollak et al. is to a virtual 'exercise' simulations, one of ordinary skill in the art will not be motivated to combine the *virtual* 'exercise' simulation occurring on a virtual terrain as disclosed by Pollak with the field of *physical* sonobuoys that transmit position of all of the buoys to a receiving vehicle as disclosed by Blume. There is no motivation or suggestion set forth in the Office Action that supports the combination of Pollack with Blume. Nor is there any identification of the teaching in either Pollack or Blume as to how the combination of these two references would be made so as to arrive at the invention as currently claimed.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 7, 10, 13, 16, 18-20 and 24 as being unpatentable over Pollak et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,106,297) in view of Tye (U.S. Patent No. 4,308,015) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

It is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case for the obviousness of the claimed invention has not been established. As discussed above, the 'exercise' disclosed by Pollak is computer generated and therefore virtual in its entirety. Pollak describes the exercise as a "simulation-based training exercise." (Col. 2, line 23) with the "various simulation units are carrying out the exercise on the virtual terrain or battle field." (Col. 6, lines 53-55). Pollak does not teach or suggest interfacing the purely virtual system as disclosed in the Pollak patent with a physical, external live fire system. Tye teaches the principle of firing *simulated* bullets at real targets. (Tye, Col. 3, lines 18-20.) (Emphasis supplied). Neither Pollak nor Tye teach the *naval weapon system fire exercise* conducted with *live fire* that can interact with a *physical* target as taught by Applicant. There is no motivation or suggestion set forth in the Office Action that

supports the combination of Pollack with Tye. Nor is there any identification of the teaching in either Pollack or Tye as to how the combination of these two references would be made so as to arrive at the invention as currently claimed.

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 12, 17, and 23 as being unpatentable over Pollak et al. in view of Blume, and further in view of Tye under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for all of the reasons previously set forth.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.
Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'BP', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Brad Pedersen
Registration No. 32,432

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thunte, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-5774